

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 6, 7, 15, 17, and 18. These sheets, which includes Figs. 6-7 and 14-18, replaces the original sheets including Figs. 6-7 and 14-18.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Remarks

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2008. Claims 1, 11, and 12 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's objections and claims 13-26 are withdrawn. Figs. 6, 7, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended in accordance with the objections of the Examiner to remove numerals that are not in the specification and add numerals that are in the specification and were not previously in the drawings.

Claims 1, 4-7, and 11-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,192,330 to Chang et al., hereinafter "*Chang*." Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 recites in step (b): "(b) folding the sheet directly back on itself by bending adjoining parts of the sheet along adjacent fold lines, the fold lines arranged at an angle that is not perpendicular or parallel to the fibres, so that said fibres are arranged in an intersecting orientation to form a prepreg having a double layer of fibres in different planes with the fibres in each adjacent layer having a different angle of orientation to a longitudinal axis of the prepreg;"

Chang does not teach step (b) in any of the embodiments. *Chang* teaches that the prepreg segment 328 is folded over segment 326 in a U shape and that the continuous fiber layers will have parallel fiber orientations. In claim 1, the sheet is folded directly back on itself without a layer in between and the fold lines are arranged at a non-perpendicular and non-parallel angle to the fibres. *Chang* does not teach or suggest either of these limitations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Chang* under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and requests the withdrawal of the rejection to said claim. Claims 4-7 and 11-12 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as above.

Claims 2-3 and 8-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "*Chang*" in view of JP 02-153938. Claims 2-3 and 8-9 are dependent from claim 1 and JP 02-153938 does not rectify the deficiencies of *Chang* in teaching claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that said claims are patentable over *Chang* in view of JP 02-153938.

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "*Chang*" in view of JP 02-153938 and further in view of US 2002/0007022. Claim 10 is dependent from claim 1 and US 2002/0007022 does not rectify the deficiencies of *Chang* and JP 02-153938 in teaching claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over *Chang* in view of JP 02-153938.

The Petition fee of \$1,110.00 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Steven Egan

By /John E Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi

Reg. No. 30,876

Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 22, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351